The Comparison of Leader Traits and Leadership Effectiveness Between Thai and Chinese-Thai Managers

การเปรียบเทียบลักษณะบุคลิกภาพของผู้นำและประสิทธิผลผู้นำ ของผู้บริหารชาวไทยและผู้บริหารชาวไทยเชื้อสายจีน

Tanapoom Ativetin[*]

Abstract

This study aimed to compare the traits of Thai and Chinese-Thai managers in terms of leadership and their associations with leadership effectiveness. Leader traits of interest in this study are drive, desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, intelligence, job-relevant knowledge and extraversion. Leadership effectiveness implied the effectiveness of management, i.e., subordinate's punctuality, non-absence from work, work effort, work standard accomplishment, work quality accomplishment, job satisfaction, and cooperation with colleagues. Research samples consisted of 57 Thai managers and 87 Chinese-Thai managers collected by questionnaires. The results found that Thai and Chinese-Thai managers significantly have different leader traits in terms of desire to lead, self-confidence, and intelligence. Their leadership effectiveness significantly differs in the aspects of subordinates' work effort, work quality accomplishment, job satisfaction, and cooperation with colleagues. 'Honesty and integrity' is the most important trait that affected most of the leadership effectiveness for both Thai and Chinese-Thai managers.

Keywords: Leadership, traits, effectiveness, Thai, Chinese-Thai, manager

[*] อาจารย์ ดร. ประจำสาขาวิชาการท่องเที่ยวและการโรงแรม ภาควิชาบริหารธุรกิจ คณะสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัย ศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ

Lecturer, Tourism & Hotel Program, Business Administration Department, Faculty of Social Science, Srinakharinwirot University, email: tanapoomati@gmail.com, tel. 0-2169-1018

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยนี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่อเปรียบเทียบลักษณะของผู้บริหารชาวไทยและผู้บริหารชาวไทยเชื้อสายจีน ในประเด็นของภาวะผู้นำที่มีความเชื่อมโยงกับประสิทธิผลผู้นำ ลักษณะบุคลิกภาพของผู้นำในงานวิจัยนี้ ประกอบด้วยแรงขับเคลื่อน ความปรารถนาที่จะเป็นผู้นำ ความซื่อสัตย์และมีศีลธรรม ความเชื่อมั่นในตนเอง ความเฉลียวฉลาด ความรู้ความสามารถในงาน และความสามารถในการเข้ากับผู้อื่นได้ ประสิทธิผลผู้นำในการ บริหารจัดการพิจารณาจากการตรงต่อเวลาของผู้ใต้บังคับบัญชา การไม่ขาดงาน ความอุตสาหะในการทำงาน การบรรลุความสำเร็จในงานตามมาตรฐาน การบรรลุความสำเร็จด้านคุณภาพงาน ความพึงพอใจในการทำงาน รวมถึงความร่วมมือกับเพื่อนร่วมงาน โดยมีกลุ่มตัวอย่างในการวิจัยประกอบด้วยผู้จัดการชาวไทยทีมีเชื้อสายไทย แท้จำนวน 57 คน และผู้จัดการชาวไทยเชื้อสายจีนจำนวน 87 คน ใช้แบบสอบถามเป็นเครื่องมือในการเก็บ ข้อมูล

ผลการวิจัยพบว่า ผู้บริหารชาวไทยและผู้บริหารชาวไทยเชื้อสายจีนมีความแตกต่างอย่างมีนัยสำคัญ ของลักษณะผู้นำด้านความปรารถนาที่จะเป็นผู้นำและด้านความเฉลียวฉลาด ส่วนในด้านประสิทธิผลผู้นำพบ ความแตกต่างอย่างมีนัยสำคัญในด้านความอุตสาหะในงาน การบรรลุความสำเร็จในงานตามมาตรฐาน ความพึง พอใจในการทำงาน และความร่วมมือกับเพื่อนร่วมงานของผู้ใต้บังคับบัญชา ทั้งนี้ คุณลักษณะด้านความซื่อสัตย์ และมีศีลธรรมเป็นคุณลักษณะที่สำคัญที่สุดที่ส่งผลต่อประสิทธิผลผู้นำทั้งกับผู้บริหารชาวไทยและผู้บริหารชาว ไทยเชื้อสายจีน

คำสำคัญ: ภาวะผู้นำ คุณลักษณะ ประสิทธิผล ไทย ไทย-จีน ผู้บริหาร

Introduction

At present, it has been accepted so far that business organizations' success has been somewhat a result of effective leadership. As we know, leadership is considered as an essence for every firm's manager to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility and empower others to create strategic changes as necessary (Hitt, Ireland & Hoskisson, 2005). In other words, leadership is social influence. It means leaving a mark. It is initiating and guiding and the result is change. By their ideas and deeds, leaders show the way and influence the behavior of others (Wren, 1995; House, Javidan, Hanges & Dorfman, 2002). Because of sophisticated competition in the global business, leadership effectiveness is inevitable for managers to achieve in order to compete successfully. Leadership effectiveness refers to a leader's performance in influencing and guiding the activities of his or her unit toward achievement of its goals (Stogdill.1950).

Managers, as same as other people in a society, are brought up by their own families, which have their own cultures, and simultaneously are influenced by cultures of other national institutes, such as schools or religions. Different cultures exist in the world (Bonvillian & Nowlin, 1994). Culture is acquired by learning and experiences. Culture is cumulative, passed down from one generation to the next. People as members of a group, organization or society share culture. Culture is based on the human capacity to symbolize. Furthermore, culture has structure and is integrated (Luthans, 1995: 534-535). It can affect managerial attitudes and how people think and behave. Values are learned from the culture in which the individual is reared, and they help to direct the person's behavior. Differences in cultures values often results in varying management practices and bring about different responses. Differences in work values have been found to reflect culture. At the same time, value similarities exist between cultures (Hodgetts & Luthans, 2003: 109-112).

As Thailand has been known very well for its distinctive characteristics as a land of blended culture since in the past; as a result, we can observe prominent evidence of various Thai people with different cultural background living in harmony and equilibrium. Among many ethnic groups of Thai people such as Indians, Muslims and Westerners, Chinese-Thai people are the biggest population with many of them earn their livings in business sectors and usually they have been regarded as the significant drive of the country's economy.

Actually, it is widely agreed that Chinese culture is strongly embedded in Chinese families in Thailand. The Chinese culture has shown great impacts on leadership effectiveness among Chinese businesspeople. They are usually taught to be hard-working, patient, be honest, spend wisely on budget and truthful. Moreover, they are very specialized in allocating the available resources to achieve their goals appropriately. Meanwhile, for Thai people, influences from family and social interactions also affect their leadership styles and effectiveness. Thais are usually taught to be sympathetic, polite, kind and helpful for one another.

In this case, it seems that Thai and Chinese-Thai leaders likely have different traits and leadership effectiveness. In accordance with the theory of traits of leaders, seven core traits have shown to be associated with leadership effectiveness. These traits include drive, desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, intelligence, job-relevant knowledge and extraversion.

The key objective to be drawn from this research is, thus, to conduct a comparison study of these distinctive characteristics among Thai and Chinese-Thai managers. This research does not argue whether leaders are born or made. In fact, it aims to reveal whether individuals with the same nationality but different cultural identity will have the same level of leader's traits and yield the same level of leadership effectiveness. The results of the research will provide a better understanding of the difference between the Thai and Chinese-Thai managers, which will eventually lead to a better cooperation within the business organizations.

Materials and Methods

1. Leader Traits and Leadership

Traits are the distinguishing personal characteristics of a leader, such as intelligence, values, self-confidence, and appearance (Daft, 2006). A leader is someone who can influence others and who has managerial authority (Robbins & Coulter, 2007). Leaders show the way and influence the behaviors of others (Wren, 1995). The leader is characterized by a strong drive for responsibility (Stogdill, 1981: 81). Great leaders get extraordinary things done in organizations by inspiring and motivating others toward a common purpose (Kouzes & Posner, 1987).

Research on leader traits in the 1920s and 1930s tried to find the characteristics that might be able to differentiate leaders from non-leaders. At that time, some of traits studied included physical stature, appearance, social class, emotional stability, fluency of speech and sociability. However, the result proved to be impossible to identify a set of traits that would always differentiate leaders from non-leaders. This maybe was due to some limited points of view to assume that there could be consistent and unique traits that would apply universally to all effective leaders whether they were in any jobs, any positions, any responsibilities or any social and cultural contexts of the world (Robbins & Coulter, 2007).

The results of the later studies were more successful when they focused on identifying leader traits in association with leadership effectiveness. Seven traits were identified as drive, the desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, intelligence, job-relevant knowledge, and extraversion (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). The seven traits mentioned above are shown below (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991; Judge, Bono and Gerhardt, 2002).

Leadership is the process of influencing a group toward the achievement of goals (Robbins & Coulter, 2007). It is the process of inspiring others to work hard to accomplish important tasks (Schermerhorn, 2002). It is the ability to influence people to willingly follow one's guidance or adhere to one's decision (Rue and Byars, 2003). In addition, the definitions of leadership include the characteristics of 'creative and directive force of morale' (Munson,

1921); 'the process by which an agent induces a subordinate to behave in a desired manner' (Bennis, 1959); 'the presence of a particular influence relationship between two or more persons' (Hollander & Julian, 1969); 'an interpersonal relation which others comply because they want to, not because they have to' (Merton, 1969); and lastly, 'actions that focus resources to create desirable opportunities' (Campbell, 1991). Excellence in leadership requires the ability to attract capable people, motivate them to put forth their best efforts, and solve problems that arise (Manning and Curtis, 2007: 1).

2. Leadership effectiveness

Hogan et al (1994) noted that leadership can be conceptualized and measured in different ways. So it is possible to separate leadership into two broad categories: leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness. In this study, we are interested in examine the effectiveness of leaders who are managers. Moreover, as Rue and Byars (2003) mentioned that in practice, effective leadership and effective management must ultimately be the same. Consequently, we assumed the effectiveness of leaders as same as the effectiveness of managers.

Leadership effectiveness refers to a leader's performance in influencing and guiding the activities of his or her unit toward achievement of its goals (Hogan et al, 1994). Effective leadership in organizations creates a vision of the future that considers the legitimate long-term interests of the parties involved in the organization, develops a strategy for moving toward that vision, enlists the support of employees to produce the movement, and motivates employees to implement the strategy (Rue and Byars, 2003). A manager's success depends on getting things done through people. Some important behaviors and attitudes include employee productivity, absenteeism, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, and workplace misbehavior (Robbins & Coulter, 2007).

Effort is the willingness to work hard at a task which is an irreplaceable component of the high-performance workplace (Schermerhorn, 2002). Daft (2006) stated that managers can exercise leadership to achieve positive outcomes. They can foster behaviors such as organizational citizenship, that is, work behavior that goes beyond job requirements and contributes as needed to the organization's success. An employee demonstrates organizational citizenship by being helpful to coworkers and customers, doing extra work when necessary and looking for ways to improve products and procedures. The attitudes of most interest to managers are those related to work, especially attitudes that influence how well employees perform. Two attitudes that might relate to high performance are job satisfaction

and commitment to the organization. Job satisfaction refers to a positive attitude toward one's job. Most managers care about their employees and simply want them to feel good about their work. Organizational commitment refers to an employee's loyalty to and engagement with the organization. Most managers want to enjoy the benefits of loyal, committed employees, including low turnover and willingness to do more than the job's basic requirements. Trust in management's decisions and integrity is an important component of organizational commitment.

3. Method

3.1 Participants

Participants included two groups of managers working in private companies in Bangkok metropolis, i.e., Thai managers (n = 57) and Chinese-Thai managers (n = 87). Thai managers are those whose family does not practice any Chinese traditions and do not have any Chinese ancestors. Chinese-Thai managers are those whose family has practiced some Chinese traditions and have Chinese ancestors. Data was collected by questionnaires.

This study is a survey research. It used a self-administered questionnaire to obtain data. The convenience sampling approach was used. The total number of returned questionnaires was 144 results in the response rate of 58 percent. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of personal characteristics of respondents.

Table 1: Personal characteristics of Thai and Chinese-Thai managers

Personal characteristics	Thai managers (%) n = 57	Chinese-Thai managers (%) n = 87
Gender		
Male	49.1	52.9
Female	50.9	47.1
Age		
Not over 35 years	35.1	25.3
36-40 years	31.6	34.5
41-45 years	10.5	24.1
46 years and over	22.8	16.1
Work position		
First-line managers	82.5	56.3
Middle to top managers	17.5	44.2

Work experience		
Not over 10 years	17.5	23.0
11-15 years	33.3	25.3
16-20 years	29.8	29.9
21 years and over	20.8	21.8

3.2 Measures

Leadership effectiveness was measured by asking managers to rate the level of behaviors and attitudes of their subordinates in their ability to meet the managers' goals and expectations. Seven behaviors and attitudes of the subordinates were listed on a set of five-point scale items in terms of punctuality, non-absence from work, work effort, work standard accomplishment, work quality accomplishment, job satisfaction, and cooperation with colleagues.

Seven leader traits consisted of drive, desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self confidence, intelligence, job-relevant knowledge, and extraversion. Respondents were asked to rate themselves on five-point scale items. Reliability analysis was performed to test internal consistency of each trait. The analysis of the reliability showed values of Cronbach's alpha of at least 0.67 or above. The definitions and the reliability test of each trait are as shown in table 2.

Table 2: Traits items and scale reliability

Scale	Items	Reliability (Cronbach's alpha)
Drive	High achievement need	.86
	Readiness to be responsible for success	
	Willingness to be responsible for failure	
	Tolerate to difficulties	
	Eager to work	
	Tolerate to take the risk	
	Willingness for criticism	
	Searching for new work methods	

Scale	Items	Reliability (Cronbach's alpha)
Desire to lead	Want to gain obedience from others	.82
	Want to gain trust from others	
	Want to be reliable for others	
	Want to be depended upon by others	
	Want to be followed by others	
Honesty and integrity	Sincere	.94
	Honest	
	Frankness	
	Moral	
	Truthful	
Self-confidence	Disclosure of all information	.84
	Have confidence on his own thought	
	Do not hesitate to make decision	
	Do not hesitate to supervise others	
	Have faith in his own decision	
Intelligence	Have ability to get ideas from a limited information	.82
	Have ability to confront with problems	
	Have visions	
	Have ability to gather data	
	Have ability to analyze information	
Job-relevant knowledge	Have knowledge about the organization	.67
	Have knowledge about the job	
	Have knowledge about the business	
Extraversion	Happy to be around with people	.91
	Like meeting with people	
	Do not afraid to talk in front of the public	
	Do not hesitate to speak out of his opinion to others	
	Happy to work with others	
	Interested in exploring new ideas	

3.3 Data Analysis

Responses were analyzed by using a computerized statistical program. The data were tested by the statistical methods of t-test and multiple regressions.

Results

The analyses in this study were conducted at the statistical significance level of 0.05. Table 3 presents the comparison of leader traits between Thai managers and Chinese-Thai managers. Results showed that Chinese-Thai managers obtained higher level of all leader traits. Thai and Chinese-Thai managers were significantly different on the desire to lead, self-confidence, and intelligence.

Table 3: Comparison of Leader Traits

Traits	Managers	Mean	SD	t	Sig.	Mean difference
Drive	Thai	3.92	.60	-1.75	.08	-.16
	Chinese-Thai	4.08	.52			
Desire to lead	Thai	3.79	.52	-2.04	.04*	-.19
	Chinese-Thai	3.98	.57			
Honesty and integrity	Thai	4.12	.58	-.40	.68	-.05
	Chinese-Thai	4.17	.76			
Self-confidence	Thai	3.62	.72	-2.71	.00*	-.30
	Chinese-Thai	3.92	.44			
Intelligence	Thai	3.35	.65	-2.87	.00*	-.29
	Chinese-Thai	3.64	.50			
Job-relevant knowledge	Thai	4.05	.53	1.10	.27	-.12
	Chinese-Thai	3.93	.63			
Extraversion	Thai	3.54	.60	-1.26	.20	-.13
	Chinese-Thai	3.67	.63			

Table 4 presents the test of the difference of means of seven aspects of leadership effectiveness between those of Thai and Chinese-Thai managers. Results of the test suggested that the Thai and Chinese-Thai managers were significantly different in the aspects of punctuality, non-absence from work, work effort, work standard accomplishment, work quality accomplishment, job satisfaction, and cooperation with colleagues. Furthermore, the results

showed that Chinese-Thai managers had leadership effectiveness at the higher level than Thai managers in all aspects.

Table 4: Comparison of Leadership effectiveness

Leadership effectiveness	Managers	Mean	SD	t	Sig.	Mean difference
Punctuality	Thai	3.68	.93	-.64	.52	-.10
	Chinese-Thai	3.78	.88			
Non-absence from work	Thai	3.65	1.08	-1.79	.07	-.30
	Chinese-Thai	3.95	.94			
Work effort	Thai	3.67	.95	-2.87	.00*	-.42
	Chinese-Thai	4.09	.73			
Work standard accomplishment	Thai	3.84	.75	-1.74	.08	-.22
	Chinese-Thai	4.06	.71			
Work quality accomplishment	Thai	3.67	.72	-2.62	.01*	-.31
	Chinese-Thai	3.98	.66			
Job satisfaction	Thai	3.49	.60	-3.31	.00*	-.34
	Chinese-Thai	3.83	.59			
Cooperation with colleagues	Thai	3.82	.78	-2.07	.04*	-.27
	Chinese-Thai	4.09	.74			

Table 5 presents regression analyses which leadership effectiveness of Thai managers, in seven aspects, is the dependent variable and seven leader traits are the independent variables. The values of adjusted R^2 indicated that the independent variables satisfactorily explained the variation of the leadership effectiveness in the aspects of subordinate's punctuality, non-absence from work, work effort, work standard accomplishment, work quality accomplishment, job satisfaction, and cooperation with colleagues, at the percentage of 19, 51, 56, 57, 59, 67, and 46, respectively.

Results of the analyses suggested that 'honesty and integrity; was the most important trait that affected the leadership effectiveness. This trait explained the variations of six aspects of leadership effectiveness, i.e., subordinate's punctuality, non-absence from work, work effort, work standard accomplishment, work quality accomplishment, and job satisfaction.

The second important trait that affected the leadership effectiveness was 'job-relevant knowledge'. This trait explained five aspects of leadership effectiveness, i.e., subordinate's non-absence from work, work effort, work standard accomplishment, work quality accomplishment, and cooperation with colleagues.

Moreover, the traits that were not relevant to leadership effectiveness of Thai managers included 'desire to lead' and 'self-confidence'. The leadership effectiveness in the aspect of subordinate's punctuality was shown to be less affected by leader traits than other aspects. In the meantime, the leadership effectiveness in the aspects of non-absence from work and work effort were more affected.

Table 5: Thai Leader Traits and Leadership Effectiveness

Traits	Punctuality		Non-absence from work		Work effort		Work standard		Work quality		Job satisfaction		Cooperation	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
Drive	.11	.72	.11	.66	.44	.07	.36	.13	.04	.85	.09	.64	.84	.00*
Desire to lead	.05	.74	.16	.22	.03	.80	-.08	.49	-.10	.37	.02	.82	-.06	.65
Honesty and integrity	.49	.03*	.59	.00*	.45	.01*	.38	.02*	.78	.00*	.57	.00*	.29	.12
Self confidence	-.37	.19	-.17	.43	-.20	.33	.03	.85	-.01	.96	-.22	.21	-.21	.36
Intelligence	.53	.06	.47	.03*	.55	.01*	.10	.61	.14	.46	.29	.10	.01	.95
Job-relevant knowledge	-.22	.18	-.34	.01*	-.52	.00*	-.28	.02*	-.28	.02*	-.10	.32	-.32	.02*
Extraversion	-.28	.16	-.20	.19	-.26	.08	.23	.12	.19	.19	.28	.03*	-.04	.79
Adjusted R^2	.19		.51		.56		.57		.59		.67		.46	

Table 6 presents regression analyses which leadership effectiveness of Chinese-Thai managers, in seven aspects, is the dependent variable and seven leader traits are the independent variables. The values of adjusted R^2 indicated that the independent variables moderately explained the variation of the leadership effectiveness in the aspects of subordinate's punctuality, non-absence from work, work effort, work standard accomplishment, work quality accomplishment, job satisfaction, and cooperation with colleagues, at the percentage of 16, 37, 48, 38, 36, 34, and 39, respectively.

Results of the analyses suggested that 'honesty and integrity; also was the most important trait that affected the leadership effectiveness. This trait explained the variations of six aspects of leadership effectiveness, i.e., subordinate's punctuality, non-absence from work, work effort, work standard accomplishment, work quality accomplishment, and job satisfaction. This showed the influence of the similar leader trait between Thai managers and Chinese-Thai managers on their effectiveness.

The second important traits that affected the leadership effectiveness were 'drive' and 'intelligence'. These traits explained two aspects of leadership effectiveness, i.e., subordinate's non-absence from work, and cooperation with colleagues.

The leadership effectiveness in the aspect of subordinate's punctuality, work effort, work standard accomplishment, work quality, and job satisfaction were shown to be less affected by leader traits. In the meantime, the leadership effectiveness in the aspects of non-absence from work was more affected.

Table 6: Chinese-Thai Leader Traits and Leadership Effectiveness

Traits	Punctuality		Non-absence from work		Work effort		Work standard		Work quality		Job satisfaction		Cooperation	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
Drive	-.06	.71	.38	.02*	.22	.13	.06	.68	.21	.19	.31	.06	.44	.00*
Desire to lead	.10	.45	.25	.04*	.06	.55	.05	.63	-.06	.57	-.02	.86	.09	.41
Honesty and integrity	.45	.00*	.41	.00*	.45	.00*	.33	.02*	.36	.01*	.43	.00*	.26	.07

Self confidence	.15	.28	.17	.17	.21	.06	.13	.29	.04	.75	.01	.88	.11	.35
Intelligence	-.15	.41	-.40	.01*	-.23	.10	-.12	.45	-.25	.11	-.25	.12	-.45	.00*
Job-relevant knowledge	.01	.96	-.28	.06	.09	.48	.25	.07	.28	.06	.02	.86	.27	.06
Extraversion	.08	.51	.05	.67	.07	.48	.10	.37	.17	.13	.21	.07	-.04	.69
Adjusted R^2	.16		.37		.48		.38		.36		.34		.39	

Discussion/Conclusion

This study examined whether Thai and Chinese Thai managers have different level of seven traits of leader, i.e., drive, desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, intelligence, job-relevant knowledge, and extraversion. Secondly, it examined the difference in the level of leadership effectiveness between the two groups of managers. Finally, it tested the association between traits and effectiveness.

Results of the study showed that differences existed in leader traits, between Thai and Chinese-Thai managers, in terms of desire to lead, self-confidence, and intelligence. This finding may implied that culture apparently has played an important role in the leader traits. Evidently, some differences between Thai and Chinese-Thai managers' traits are found. In addition, the descriptive analysis also found that the Chinese-Thai managers have higher level of traits in all traits.

These findings reflected the rigidity of how the Chinese-Thai managers were raised up to be attentive to their ways of living and doing business. However, the multiple regression analysis showed that these three traits have no significant to most of the aspects of the leadership effectiveness. Therefore, it can be assumed that if the differences in the leadership effectiveness existed between the Thai and Chinese-Thai managers, there must apparently be influenced by other factors, not the traits. However, the multiple regressions analysis showed that some traits affected leadership effectiveness.

The results of the study also showed that the traits of self-confidence and extraversion have no significant relationship with the leadership effectiveness of both groups of managers. This might contradict to what the western researchers have suggested. In Thai society, perhaps the distance of power is high. Subordinates always listen to their managers.

Managers are not expected to show their confidence or have interaction with their subordinate. Moreover, the descriptive analysis also showed that both groups of managers rated themselves at the moderate level. It implied that these traits perhaps are not much important to both managers and subordinates.

The trait that both Thai and Chinese-Thai managers similarly rated themselves at the high level is 'honesty and integrity'. It's not surprising because this trait is regarded as the important values in doing business for people in countries in East and Southeast Asia, including Thailand. Managers are expected to show characteristics of honesty – so that they can build trusting relationships between them and their subordinates or other relevant parties. This can be done by being truthful or non-deceitful. Moreover, they have to demonstrate a high level of consistency between word and deed. By implementing these concepts into actions, it will help enhancing credibility of leaders which will eventually result in their leadership effectiveness. This belief is confirmed by the multiple regressions analysis. It is found that 'honesty and integrity' has significant relationship with six aspects of leadership effectiveness of Thai managers as well as of Chinese-Thai managers.

In addition to honesty and integrity, other trait which is shown to be important for the success of Thai managers includes 'job-relevant knowledge'. It suggested that the manager's ability will be fully exploited if they can show their staff that they possess a high degree of knowledge about the company, industry and technical matters. The leader that is a true expert in the field can supervise their subordinates very well which will result in the latter's high performance. From the descriptive analysis, both Thai and Chinese-Thai managers similarly rated themselves at the high level. However, the multiple regressions analysis showed that only this trait of Thai managers significantly affected their leadership effectiveness.

On the other hand, the trait such as 'the desire to lead' has no significant influence on the leadership effectiveness in almost every aspect. This finding did not support the western theory but it is perhaps understandable to Thai society. It is because in Thai society, it is a cultural practice for its members to keep silent and be humble. Showing the desire to lead may be interpreted as being very aggressive in a negative way. However, the t-test showed the difference on this trait between the Thai and Chinese-Thai managers. The latter managers showed higher desire to lead and this trait significantly affected their leadership effectiveness.

As a further suggestion for the Chinese-Thai managers whose drive and intelligence are considered to be crucial factors for leadership effectiveness, the leaders are required to develop themselves in such dimensions including abilities of problem-solving and decision-making. Indeed, a 'keen mind', such as strong analytical ability, good judgment and the capacity to think strategically and multi-dimensionally, is necessary for effective leadership. Furthermore, leadership effectiveness requires 'above average intelligence' rather than genius, which the leaders can achieve both through the formal learning tools provided by the firms and by experiences they gained from working and cooperating with their colleagues.

References

Brockner, J. Siegel, P. A., Daly, J. P., Tyler, T. & Martin, C. (1997, September). When trust matters: The moderating effect of outcome favorability. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 558.

Dirks, K. T. & Ferrin, D. L. (2002, August). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 611-628.

Gedne, C.R. (1999). Leadership Effectiveness and Gender. *A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty*, Alabama: Air Command and Staff College Air University.

Gheselli, E. (1963). Managerial talent. *American Psychologist, 18,* 631-642.

Hitt, M.A., Ireland R.D. & Hoskisson R.E. (2005). *Strategic Management: Competitiveness and Globalization.* Ohio: Thomson South-Western.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G.J., Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologists*, *49*, 493-504.

Hosmer, L. T. (1995, April). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 393.

House, R., Javidan, M., Hanges, P. & Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding Cultures and Implicit Leadership Theories across the Globe: An Introduction to Project GLOBE. *Journal of World Business*, *37*, 3-10.

Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R.C., & Curphy, G. J. (1993). *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*. Richard D. Irwin INC.

Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Illies, R. & Gerhard, M.W. (2002, August). Personality and Leadership: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 765-780.

Kirkpatrick, S.A. & Locke, E.A. (1991, May). Leadership: Do traits Really Matter? *Academy of Management Executive*, 48-60.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The Leadership Challenge: How to get Extraordinary Things done in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How Leaders Gain and Lose It, and Why People Demand It.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Manning, G. & Curtis, K. (2007). *The Art of Leadership*. Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Robbins, S.P. & Coulter, M. (2007). *Management*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Rue, L. W. & Byars, L. L. (2003). *Management*. Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Schermerhorn, J. R. (2002). *Management*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Schindler, P. L. & Thomas, C. C. (1993, October). The structure of interpersonal trust in the workplace. *Psychological Reports*. 563-573.

Stogdill, R. M. (1950). Leadership, membership, and organization. *Psychological Bulletin, 47*, 1-14.

Stogdill, R.M. (1981). *Handbook of Leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Tan, H. H. & Tan, C. S. F. (2000, May). Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 241-260.

Wren, J.T. (1995). *The Leader's Companion: Insights on Leadership through the Ages*. New York: Free Press.